

August 19, 1967

Mr. J. R. Wiggins, Editor
The Washington Post
1515 L Street, NW
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Wiggins:

Your National Editor's lament about "The Kennedy Book Deluge" would come with better grace from the Post if it had not been part of the "deluge" and were this not a subject that, in a democratic society, cannot be exhausted.

The part of the Post is partisan: Without reason or thought, you oppose and assail those who question the dubious official investigation. To this end you serialized the slanders of the sycophantic coward, Charles Roberts, and were so impatient to spread the lies and misrepresentations of the also-partisan Associated Press that you published its entire book-length series in one single, awful bellyache.

Lawrence Stern is right in describing "Death of a President" as "a brilliant and poignant failure", wrong in attributing it to "the love and awe he held toward his subject". Those noble feelings that author reserves for himself. His failure is from simple and undeviating factual error. This and the ensuing scandal I predicted to the Post's editors more than a year before publication, to you personally fourteen months ago.

For the first time in the Post's own deluge, Stern shows the beginning of understanding in asking "why" in his review of "The Manchester Affair". When you understand why the Kennedy family had to file suit against the Manchestrian assemblage, you will begin to understand the terrible trauma of the Warren Report.

I also predicted the suit and in countless radio and TV appearances explained why. My own book on it was a third completed before "Death" was published. I will complete it ~~when~~ I have finished the book I am now writing. Before then, my OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS will be published. At that time, should the Post again assume the mantle of a great newspaper, I will make available to you the more than 300 pages of official documentation I have for it.

Had you read the WHITEWASH series, you would know the answer. Had Stern, when he was assigned to read the manuscript of the first book, he, too, would have known. Had you listened to Dan Kurzman, who did read and understand it, your subsequent and very public self-demeaning would have been spared you, and our country might have been the better for it.

Why not make an honest woman of the old lady for whom you pimp on this subject and, with appropriate excisions, print this letter?

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg